

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT MEETING DATE: August 21, 2002

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ADJUSTMENTS

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

- 1. Open and close Public Hearing
- 2. Introduce the Ordinance
- 3. Adopt the Resolution
- 4. Direct staff to return to City Council within one year concerning the Library Impact Fee and options to fund the Sports Complex (Sports Fields)
- 5. Direct staff to return to City Council by January 2007 to begin new review of impact fees

Agenda Item # 21
Prepared By:
Finance Director
Submitted By:
City Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: On May 22, staff and the City's consultant, Maximus, presented proposed changes to development impact fees for General Government Facilities, Libraries, Traffic, Police, Fire, Parks, Local Drainage, Sewer, and Water. Staff recommends that new fees for Community & Recreation Centers and for Open Space not be adopted at this time and that staff return within one year with more detailed information concerning how to fund the Sports Complex (Sports Fields). It is also recommended that the Library fee not be updated at this time, pending the outcome of the City's Prop. 14 grant application.

On June 26, the City Council opened a public hearing on proposed fee adjustments and continued the public hearing on development impact fees until July 17, when the public hearing was continued until August 21. In response to City Council direction, Exhibit A to the attached Resolution now reflects adjustments of fees evenly over a 3 year period. Staff recommends that the first adjustments be implemented as of 1/15/03. Since the phase-in approach is now proposed, staff has deleted the previous recommendation to allow prepayments.

Staff has reviewed the City Council's direction to return with information regarding "locking in home builder projects at the vesting tentative map or something that could work better (flexibility), payable at occupancy." Past and planned development agreements for residential projects processed through Measure P include the following: "The City shall be entitled to impose development fees and apply building standards which are in effect at the time the building permits are actually issued rather than those effective as of the date of the agreement." Therefore, this contract language establishes fees when building permits are issued; and fees are paid at occupancy. The effect of this language is to reduce fees collected under any option by an estimated \$1.5 million. The City's estimated cost, in fees otherwise collected, for implementing adjustments under varying assumptions would be <u>one</u> of the following options, as further explained in the attached staff report:

1) Implement new fees 1/15/03, with no developer assistance: \$1.5 million \underline{or}

2) Residential & commercial prepayments with no phase-in: \$5.4 million <u>or</u>

3) ($\underline{\textit{Recommended}}$) 3 year phase-in for commercial & residential with no prepayments: \$4.1 million $\underline{\textit{or}}$

4) 3 year phase-in with residential & commercial prepayments by 1/6/03:

\$4.6 million

<u>In addition</u>, in response to Council direction, staff recommends that the City allow applicants to pay existing fees for sewer & traffic impact fees for shell buildings, "finaled" as of 1/6/03, when the improvements are installed, if installed prior to June 2004. This action could cost the City <u>\$1 million</u> more in lost fees.

As proposed, the total impact fees for a single family home would increase by 54% from \$13,550 to \$20,846. An additional \$600 increase for the 3.8% January 2003 engineering cost index adjustment would bring the total to \$21,446, as shown on Exhibit A. Attached are two consultant reports concerning fees and an Ordinance changing the timing of the engineering cost index adjustment from each July to each January.

FISCAL IMPACT: The amount to be collected from future development, as projected until build-out, for the 8 impact fees with adjustments would be nearly \$195 million. However, this amount could be reduced by as much as \$6.4 million, if all eligible projects took advantage of potential payment options. This shortfall would need to be picked up by other funding sources and could not be charged to future development.



Memorandum

Date: August 21, 2002

To: Jack Dilles, Finance Director

From: Chu Thai, Budget Manager

Subject: Fiscal Analysis of Proposed Development Impact Fee Implementation

On May 22, staff and the City's consultant, Maximus, presented proposed changes to development impact fees for General Government Facilities, Libraries, Traffic, Police, Fire, Parks, Local Drainage, Sewer, and Water. On June 26, the City Council opened a public hearing on proposed fee adjustments and continued the public hearing on development impact fees until July 17, when the public hearing was continued until August 21. Staff has reviewed the City Council's direction of July 17, and is returning with the following information.

There were discussions about paying residential impact fees at the vesting of a tentative map. Past and planned development agreements for residential projects processed through Measure P include the following: "The City shall be entitled to impose development fees and apply building standards which are in effect at the time the building permits are actually issued rather than those effective as of the date of the agreement." Therefore, this contract language establishes fees when building permits are issued; and fees are paid at occupancy. The effect of this language is to reduce fees collected under any option by an estimated \$1.5 million. The City's estimated cost, in fees otherwise collected, for implementing adjustments under varying assumptions would be one of the following options:

Scenario	\$ Loss
1) Full implementation of proposed impact fees on January 15, 2003,	<\$1.5 mil>
2) Pre-payment of allocated development using current impact fees,	<\$5.4 mil>
3) Phase-in of proposed impact fees over the next three years, and	<\$4.1 mil>
4) Pre-payment of allocated development and phase-in of proposed impact fees over the next three years.	<\$4.6 mil>

With **Scenario 1**, the City will lose \$1.5 million in potential impact fee revenues due to the proposed January 15, 2003 implementation date. Maximus' analysis estimates that the City will obtain \$195 million in impact fee revenues if the proposed impact fees were in place on January 2002, but with the (one year) later implementation date, the City will now only collect \$193.5 million.

Scenario 2, which proposes pre-payment by January 15, 2003, is calculated to bring the most loss in impact fee revenues. The \$5.4 million loss is attributable to a \$1.5 million loss due to the timing of implementation, a \$1.2 million loss from residential pre-payment, and \$2.7 million loss from commercial/industrial pre-payment. The amount of the shortfall depends on the volume of development activity and number of developers who choose to pre-pay. If there is little activity in the next five months, or if developers choose not pro pre-pay, the shortfall would be minimized. While Scenario 2 is calculated with the most revenue loss, it also is the easiest to administer, for both city staff and developers.

Scenario 3, the phase-in scenario, would require staff to monitor and administer the implementation process for a three-year period. Effective dates will be January 15 of each year for the next three years, and the phase-in increase will be approximately 33% per year. Potential revenue loss from this scenario is estimated at \$4.1 million, with \$3.1 million loss from residential development and \$0.95 million from commercial/industrial development.

Scenario 4 combines pre-payment with the phasing-in of impact fees. Developers who choose not to pre-pay the current impact fees by January 15, 2003, will pay phased-in impact fees within the next three years. Staff calculates the total loss for this scenario to be \$4.6 million, with a \$3.1 million loss from residential development and a \$1.5 million loss from commercial/industrial development.

Attached is the chart comparing development impact fees among municipalities. On July 15, 2002, the City of Gilroy increased their impact fees by an estimated 38%, and the attached chart reflects this increase.

Comparison of Municipal Impact Fees

		Morg	an Hill	Gilroy ¹	San Jose ²	San Ramon ³	Fremont ⁴	Dublin ⁵
		Current	Proposed	Adopted	Current	Current	Current	Current
Single Family Residentia	Units	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee
Water	DU	\$ 1,154	1,769	2,600	270	-	-	5,200
Sewer	DU	5,416	8,026	7,090	447	-	-	11,050
General Government	DU	283	466	3,100	-	-	1,650	12,777
Libraries	DU	216	216	-	-	-	-	-
Street Improvements	DU	2,123	2,811	5,580	362	1,467	1,916	7,008
Police	DU	121	164	2,890	-	-	-	-
Fire	DU	718	447	1,240	-	-	221	657
Parks	DU	2,419	5,298	10,340	6,900	-	17,015	-
Local Drainage	DU	1,100	1,649	194	270	9,750	-	2,916
Construction Tax (\$0.08/s	1 SF	-	-	-	200	-	-	-
TOTAL		\$13,550	20,846	33,034	8,449	11,217	20,802	39,608

NOTES:

- Specific Plan Designation: \$5,094
- Traffic Impact Fees to reimburse the City of Pleasanton for freeway interchanges: \$253.50
- Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fee: \$1,162

¹ On 7/15/02, the Gilroy City Council adopted Resolution 2002-58, which will increase their impact fees by an estimated 38%.

Effective 60 days after adoption, Gilroy's DIF for a single residential unit will increase from \$24,021 to approximately \$33,034 per unit.

² San Jose: Street improvements of \$362/peak hour trip. Construction tax based on 2,500 s.f. unit

³ San Ramon: Traffic fees range from \$1,467-3,036. Drainage fees range from \$9,750-10,500.

⁴ Fremont: Park fees include \$3,709 for park facilities and \$13,309 for park dedication (parklands)

Dublin: Public facilities fees range from \$12,777-13,001. Local drainage based on 6,000 s.f. of impervious surface Street improvements fee include:

ORDINANCE NO. 1581, NEW SERIES

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL AMENDING SECTIONS 3.56.050 of CHAPTER 3.56 (Development Impact Mitigation Fees) of TITLE 3 (Revenue and Finance) OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL REGARDING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT MITIGATION FEES

WHEREAS, new development within the City of Morgan Hill will result in additional population and business growth, and such growth will place additional burdens on various city facilities, infrastructure and services, requiring construction of expanded and/or new city facilities and services; and,

WHEREAS, all development within the City of Morgan Hill should bear a proportionate financial burden in the construction and improvement of public facilities and services which are necessary to serve the growth engendered by such development; and,

WHEREAS, the imposition of development impact fees is the preferred method of ensuring that new development bears its proportionate share of the cost of public facilities and service improvements; and,

WHEREAS, imposition of impact fees to finance public facilities and service improvements required by new development is necessary in order to avoid adversely impacting existing facilities and services; and,

WHEREAS, consistent with these principles, Chapter 3.56 of the Municipal Code of the City of Morgan Hill establishes Development Impact Mitigation Fees; and,

WHEREAS, Section 3.56.060 of the Municipal Code of the City of Morgan Hill provides for revision of established fees, including increases, by resolution; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Morgan Hill has received and duly considered the reports entitled "Development Impact Fee Study," dated May 9, 2002, authored by DMG Maximus and "Water and Sewer Rate and Connection Fee Study" dated May 17, 2002, by Hilton Farnkopf & Hobson, LLC ("Hilton"); and,

WHEREAS, based upon the DMG Maximus and Hilton reports, and the evidence presented to it, the City Council deems it necessary that development impact fees be adjusted to ensure that new development in the city pays its proportionate share of public facilities and service improvements necessary to accommodate such development in order to promote the public health, safety and welfare; and,

WHEREAS, the adjustment of development impact fees necessitates minor revisions to the Municipal Code provisions regarding such fees; and,

City of Morgan Hill Ordinance No. 1581, New Series Page -2-

WHEREAS, a public hearing on adoption of this ordinance was duly noticed, and held as part of a regular City Council meeting held on August 21, 2002, at 7:30 p.m. in the Council chambers located at City Hall, 17555 Peak Avenue; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council has received and duly considered all written and verbal comments provided to it by staff and the public, which comments are hereby incorporated into the record on this matter; and,

NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL, CALIFORNIA, DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 3.56.050 of the Municipal Code of the City of Morgan Hill is hereby amended to provide:

"Each fee imposed by this chapter shall be adjusted automatically on July 1st January 15th of each fiscal year, beginning on July 1, 1994 January 15, 2004, by a percentage equal to the Engineering Cost Index as published by Engineer News Record for the preceding twelve months month period ending the previous March. Each fee imposed by this chapter shall also be adjusted automatically on January 15, 2003, by a percentage equal to the Engineering Code Index as published by the Engineering News Record for the three month period beginning January 2002 through March 2002. This automatic adjustment shall not apply to fees which are based on variable factors which result in automatic adjustments or those which specifically indicate otherwise."

SECTION 2. Severability. If any part of this Ordinance is held to be invalid or inapplicable to any situation by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or the applicability of this Ordinance to other situations.

SECTION 3. Exemption from CEQA. Pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15061 and 15273(4), the City Council finds that this ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act.

SECTION 4. Effective Date; Publication. This Ordinance shall take effect from and after sixty (60) days after the date of its adoption. The City Clerk is hereby directed to publish this ordinance pursuant to §36933 of the Government Code.

// // // // //

This ordinance was introduced at a Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of

Page -3-Morgan Hill held on the 21st day of August, 2002, and was finally adopted at a Regular meeting of said Council on the 4th day of September, 2002; by the following vote: **AYES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: NOES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: ABSENT: COUNCIL MEMBERS: ABSTAIN: COUNCIL MEMBERS: ATTEST: APPROVED: Dennis Kennedy, Mayor** Irma Torrez, City Clerk **₹** CERTIFICATION **₹** I, IRMA TORREZ, CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL, **CALIFORNIA**, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 1581, New Series, adopted by the City Council of the City of Morgan Hill, California at their Regular meeting held on the 4th day of September, 2002. WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL.

IRMA TORREZ, City Clerk

City of Morgan Hill

Ordinance No. 1581, New Series

DATE:

RESOLUTION NO. 5592

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL RESCINDING RESOLUTIONS 5497 AND 5498, REGARDING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES, AND ADOPTING INCREASED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

WHEREAS, new development within the City of Morgan Hill will result in additional population and business growth, and such growth will place additional burdens on various city facilities, infrastructure and services, requiring construction of expanded and/or new city facilities and services; and,

WHEREAS, all development within the City of Morgan Hill should bear a proportionate financial burden in the construction and improvement of public facilities and services which are necessary to serve the growth engendered by such development; and,

WHEREAS, the imposition of development impact fees is the preferred method of ensuring that new development bears its proportionate share of the cost of public facilities and service improvements; and,

WHEREAS, imposition of impact fees to finance public facilities and service improvements required by new development is necessary in order to avoid adversely impacting existing facilities and services; and,

WHEREAS, consistent with these principles, Chapter 3.56 of the Municipal Code of the City of Morgan Hill establishes Development Impact Mitigation Fees; and,

WHEREAS, Section 3.56.060 of the Municipal Code of the City of Morgan Hill provides for revision of established fees, including increases, by resolution; and,

WHEREAS, Resolutions 5497 and 5498, as adopted by the City Council, have set various fee rates for development impact fees; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Morgan Hill has received and duly considered the reports entitled "Development Impact Fee Study," dated May 9, 2002, authored by DMG Maximus and the "Water and Sewer Rate and Connection Fee Study" dated May 17, 2002, by Hilton Farnkopf & Hobson, LLC ("Hilton"); and,

WHEREAS, the DMG Maximus and Hilton reports analyzed the City's existing land use patterns and zoning, and the goals and objectives of the City's general plan; and,

City of Morgan Hill Resolution No. 5592 Page -2-

WHEREAS, the DMG Maximus and Hilton reports determined the public facilities and service improvements engendered by anticipated future development in light of the General Plan and existing and projected land use patterns and zoning; and,

WHEREAS, as the DMG Maximus and Hilton reports demonstrate, the development impact fees established by this resolution are based upon estimated costs for new public facilities and service improvements, which will be required, incrementally, by new development within the City; and,

WHEREAS, as the DMG Maximus and Hilton reports demonstrate, the development impact fees established by this resolution do not exceed the reasonable cost of providing public facilities and service improvements occasioned by development projects within the City; and,

WHEREAS, the fees established by the DMG Maximus and Hilton reports rationally relate to the reasonable cost of providing public facilities occasioned by the development projects and service improvements within the City; and,

WHEREAS, a public hearing on adoption of this resolution and the fees outlined in Exhibit A attached hereto was noticed pursuant to and in compliance with Government Code section 6062(a), and set as part of a special City Council meeting held on June 26, 2002; as part of a regularly scheduled City Council meeting held on July 17, 2002; and again as part of a special City Council meeting held on August 21, 2002, all in the Council chambers located at City Hall, 17555 Peak Avenue; and,

WHEREAS, the DMG Maximus and Hilton reports, as well as all material supplementary thereto, and all background data referenced in the reports, were available for public inspection and review at the City Clerk's office of the City of Morgan Hill; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council has received and duly considered all written and verbal comments provided to it by staff and the public, which comments are hereby incorporated into the record on this matter; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council deems it necessary that development impact fees be adjusted to ensure that new development in the city pays its proportionate share of public facilities and service improvements necessary to accommodate such development in order to promote the public health, safety and welfare; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby incorporates the findings made in Municipal Code section 3.56.010, and applies them in support of the adoption of this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Morgan Hill, based upon all documents, statements and facts known to the City, does hereby resolve:

SECTION 1. Rescission of Prior Resolutions. Resolutions 5497 and 5498 are hereby rescinded.

SECTION 2. Findings. The City Council hereby finds as follows:

- A. All provisions set forth above are true and correct, and are hereby incorporated herein as findings of this Council by reference.
- B. The purpose of the fees set forth herein is to finance public facilities, including streets and traffic mitigation measures, and to reduce the impacts of development on public services and facilities caused by new development.
- C. The capital facility fees collected pursuant to this Resolution shall be used to finance only the public facilities and services described or identified in <u>Exhibit A</u>, attached hereto, to which the specific fee relates.
- D. There is a need for public facilities which have not yet been constructed and are required to be constructed to be consistent with the City's General Plan, and to protect the public's health, safety and welfare.
- E. The facts and evidence presented to the City Council establish that there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the described public facilities and the impacts from the type of development described to the City Council for which the corresponding fee is charged.
- F. The facts and evidence presented to the City Council establish that the cost estimates set forth are reasonable cost estimates, and the fees expected to be generated by new development will not exceed these costs.
- G. The fees set forth herein are consistent with the City's General Plan and the Council has considered the effect of the fees on the City's housing needs, as established in the Housing Element of the General Plan, and the regional housing needs.
- H. Based on the evidence submitted to the Council, the contributions made in the context of the Measure P competition are voluntary in nature and are not duplicative of the impact fees.

SECTION 3. Adoption of Fees. Therefore, development impact fees for the City of Morgan Hill are established as stated in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

SECTION 4. <u>Implementation Dates</u>. The City Council hereby orders that all increases in development impact fees be effective January 15, 2003, subject to the guidelines established below.

City of Morgan Hill Resolution No. 5592 Page -4-

The City Council finds that this delay in implementation is necessary to (1) encourage the economic well-being of the community through proactive initiatives which leverage private sector investment and involvement, namely lessening some of the cost impacts on projects, and (2) to allow developers certainty in the development process. The City Council further finds that the following guidelines are necessary for proper administration of the fees, and shall be applied by City staff.

- A. <u>Phased-In Increases</u>: Development impact fees shall increase at the rates stated in <u>Exhibit A</u>, over a period of three (3) years beginning January 15, 2003. Prior to the increase imposed on January 15, 2003, applicants that have been awarded Measure P allotments may prepay all impact fees for those allotments. If extensions of those original allotments are obtained after January 15, 2003, applicants must pay the fees in effect when the building permits are issued.
- B. <u>Commercial/Industrial Development</u>: Applicants that have submitted a complete set of building plans for "shell" buildings, as determined in the discretion of the Building Official, prior to January 15, 2003, and have paid all other applicable impact fees, may pay those impact fees that are solely triggered by tenant improvements at the rates in existence prior to January 15, 2003. This guideline shall expire on July 15, 2004, and any building permits pulled for tenant improvements after that date shall pay the impact fee rates then in effect. Applicants that allow building permits to expire will be required to pay the rates in effect when building permits are re-issued.

SECTION 5. Automatic Annual Adjustment. Each fee fixed herein shall be adjusted automatically on January 15th of each fiscal year, beginning on January 15, 2003, consistent with Section 3.56.050 of the Municipal Code.

SECTION 6. Refunds, Exemptions, Credits, and Adjustments. Refunds, exemptions, credit and adjustments to payment of impact fees shall be made and/or calculated in accordance with the applicable provisions of Chapter 3.56 of the Municipal Code.

SECTION 7. Chapter 3.56. The provisions of this resolution are subject and subordinate to the provisions of Chapter 3.56 of the Municipal Code, and shall at all times be construed and applied consistent therewith, as the same presently exists or from time to time be hereafter amended.

SECTION 8. Challenges to Resolution. Any judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside or annul this resolution or any provision thereof shall be brought within one hundred and twenty (120) days of its adoption by the City Council.

SECTION 9. Exemption from CEQA. Pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15061 and 15273(4), the City Council finds that this resolution is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act.

City of Morgan	Hill
Resolution No. :	5592
Page -5-	

SECTION 10. Severability. If any portion of this Resolution is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction then it is the intent of the City Council that all other portions of the Resolution shall be severed and remain in full force and effect.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Morgan Hill at a Regular Meeting held on the 21st day of August 2002, by the following vote.

AYES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: NOES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: ABSENT: COUNCIL MEMBERS: ABSTAIN: COUNCIL MEMBERS:

CERTIFICATION

I, IRMA TORREZ, CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL, CALIFORNIA, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. adopted by the City Council at the Regular Meeting on August 21, 2002.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL.

DATE:	
	IRMA TORREZ, City Clerk

		EXISTI			1/15/03		1/15/03	TOTA			5/04		1/15/04	1/15/04		1/15/05		1/15/05	1/15/05
00101 = = 11 <i>0</i> 1 \ 7 = = 1	UNIT		ES	ΑĽ	DJSTMT		INDEX*	1/6/0)3 A	ADJS	TMT		FEES	INDEX**	AD	JSTMT		FEES	INDEX***
SINGLE FAMILY RES				•		•									•				TDD
Water	dwelling unit			\$	205	\$	52	\$ 1,41			205	\$	1,616	TBD	\$	205	\$	1,821	TBD
Sewer	dwelling unit	5,4			870		239	6,52			870		7,395	TBD		870		8,265	TBD
Public Facilities	dwelling unit		83		61		13	35			61		418	TBD		61		479	TBD
Library	dwelling unit		16		-		8	22			-		224	TBD		-		224	TBD
Traffic	dwelling unit	2,1			230		89	2,44			229		2,671	TBD		229		2,900	TBD
Police	dwelling unit		21		15		5	14			14		155	TBD		14		169	TBD
Fire	dwelling unit		18		(271)		17	46			-		464	TBD				464	TBD
Local Drainage	dwelling unit	1,1			183	_	49	1,33			183	_	1,515	TBD		183	_	1,698	TBD
Subtotal before Park	dwelling unit	\$ 11,1	31	\$	1,293	\$	472	\$12,89	<u>6</u> §	§ 1,	,562	\$	14,458	TBD	\$	1,562	\$	16,020	TBD
Park Improvement	dwelling unit							\$ 88	6			\$	1,128	TBD			\$	1,370	TBD
Park In Lieu-Subdiv.	dwelling unit							2,62	0				3,338	TBD				4,056	TBD
Total Park	dwelling unit	\$ 2,4	19	\$	959	\$	128	\$ 3,50	<u>-</u> 6 \$	6	960	\$	4,466	TBD	\$	960	\$	5,426	TBD
Total Single Family I	-			\$	2,252	\$	600	\$16,40	2 \$	5 2.	522	\$	18,924	TBD	\$	2,522	\$	21,446	TBD
		¥ 10,0	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		410,10	= 2	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	10,021		<u> </u>		<u> </u>		
SINGLE FAMILY RES	SIDENTIAL - N	lo Subd	ivisi	<u>ion</u>															
Water	dwelling unit	\$ 1,1	54	\$	205	\$	52	\$ 1,41	1 \$	5	205	\$	1,616	TBD	\$	205	\$	1,821	TBD
Sewer	dwelling unit	5,4	16		870		239	6,52	5		870		7,395	TBD		870		8,265	TBD
Public Facilities	dwelling unit	2	83		61		13	35	7		61		418	TBD		61		479	TBD
Library	dwelling unit	2	16		-		8	22	4		-		224	TBD		-		224	TBD
Traffic	dwelling unit	2,1	23		230		89	2,44	2		229		2,671	TBD		229		2,900	TBD
Police	dwelling unit	1	21		15		5	14	1		14		155	TBD		14		169	TBD
Fire	dwelling unit	7	18		(271)		17	46	4		-		464	TBD		-		464	TBD
Local Drainage	dwelling unit	1,1	00		183		49	1,33	2		183		1,515	TBD		183		1,698	TBD
Subtotal before Park	dwelling unit	\$ 11,1	31	\$	1,293	\$	472	\$12,89	6 9	<u> </u>	562	\$	14,458	TBD	\$	1,562	\$	16,020	TBD
	3	- /		<u>-</u>	,	<u>-</u>		- ,		,					<u>-</u>	,	<u>-</u>		
Park Improvement	dwelling unit							\$ 88	6			\$	1,128	TBD			\$	1,370	TBD
Park In Lieu-No Sub.	dwelling unit							2,11	<u>3</u>				2,342	TBD				2,570	TBD
Total Park	dwelling unit	\$ 2,4	<u> 19</u>	\$	471	\$	109	\$ 2,99	9 \$	5	471	\$	3,470	TBD	\$	470	\$	3,940	TBD
Total Single Family I	Residential - N	\$ 13,5	<u>50</u>	\$	1,764	\$	581	\$15,89	5 \$	2,	,033	\$	17,928	TBD	\$	2,032	\$	19,960	TBD

	UNIT	EX	ISTING FEES	ΑI	1/15/03 DJSTMT		1/15/03 INDEX*	TOTAL 1/6/03	ΑC	1/15/04 DJSTMT		1/15/04 FEES	1/15/04 INDEX**	Αſ	1/15/05 DJSTMT	1/15/05 FEES	5 1/15/05 5 INDEX***
MULTI-FAMILY RES		ıbdi						., ., .,									
Water	dwelling unit	\$	1,041	\$	185	\$	47	\$ 1,273	\$	185	\$	1,458	TBD	\$	185	\$ 1,643	TBD
Sewer	dwelling unit		4,584		737		202	5,523		736		6,259	TBD		736	6,995	TBD
Public Facilities	dwelling unit		241		47		11	299		47		346	TBD		46	392	TBD
Library	dwelling unit		181		-		7	188		-		188	TBD		-	188	TBD
Traffic	dwelling unit		1,486		161		62	1,709		161		1,870	TBD		160	2,030	TBD
Police	dwelling unit		191		135		12	338		135		473	TBD		135	608	TBD
Fire	dwelling unit		542		(368)		7	181		-		181	TBD		-	181	TBD
Local Drainage	dwelling unit		330		215		21	566		215		781	TBD		214	995	TBD
Subtotal before Park	dwelling unit	\$	8,596	\$	1,112	\$	369	\$10,077	\$	1,479	\$	11,556	TBD	\$	1,476	\$ 13,032	TBD
	Ŭ	-	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u>-</u>				<u> </u>	<u>-</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>		
Park Improvement	dwelling unit							\$ 737			\$	929	TBD			\$ 1,121	TBD
Park In Lieu-Subdiv.	dwelling unit							2,180			•	2,750	TBD			3,320	TBD
Total Park	dwelling unit	\$	2,048	\$	762	\$	107	\$ 2,917	\$	762	\$		TBD	\$	762	\$ 4,441	TBD
Total Multi-Family R	=			\$	1,874	\$	476	\$12,994	\$	2,241	_	15,235	TBD	\$	2,238	\$ 17,473	TBD
rotal multi-Fallilly K	esideriliai - St	Ψ	10,044	<u>φ</u>	1,074	Ψ	470	\$12,334	Φ	2,241	Ψ	13,233	IBD	Ψ	2,230	φ 17,473	טטו
MULTI-FAMILY RES	IDENTIAL - No	Su	ıbdivisid	on													
Water	dwelling unit		1,041		185	\$	47	\$ 1,273	\$	185	\$	1,458	TBD	\$	185	\$ 1,643	TBD
Sewer	dwelling unit	,	4,584	•	737	•	202	5,523	Ť	736	•	6,259	TBD	•	736	6,995	TBD
Public Facilities	dwelling unit		241		47		11	299		47		346	TBD		46	392	TBD
Library	dwelling unit		181		_		7	188		_		188	TBD		-	188	TBD
Traffic	dwelling unit		1,486		161		62	1,709		161		1,870	TBD		160	2,030	TBD
Police	dwelling unit		191		135		12	338		135		473	TBD		135	608	TBD
Fire	dwelling unit		542		(368)		7	181		-		181	TBD		-	181	TBD
Local Drainage	dwelling unit		330		215		21	566		215		781	TBD		214	995	TBD
Subtotal before Park	dwelling unit	\$	8,596	\$	1,112	\$	369	\$10,077	\$	1,479	\$	11,556	TBD	\$	1,476	\$ 13,032	TBD
Castotal Sololo I alik	a.roming arm	Ψ	3,000	Ψ	1,112	Ψ		Ψ10,011	Ψ_	1,170	Ψ_	. 1,000		Ψ	1,170	ψ 10,002	, 55
								\$ 737			\$	929	TBD			\$ 1,121	TBD
Park Improvement	dwellina unit							Ψ 131								Ψ I.IZI	ישטו
Park Improvement Park In Lieu-No Sub.	dwelling unit							-			•						
Park In Lieu-No Sub.	•	\$	2 048	\$	362	\$	92	1,765	\$	362	_	1,935	TBD	\$	362	2,105	TBD
•	dwelling unit	\$ <u></u>	2,048 10,644	<u>\$</u>	362 1,474	<u>\$</u>	92 461	-	<u>\$</u>	362 1,841	\$	1,935 2,864		\$	362 1,838		

	UNIT	EXISTING FEES	1/15/03 ADJSTMT	1/15/03 INDEX*		1/15/04 ADJSTMT	1/15/04 FEES	1/15/04 INDEX**		1/15/05 FEES	1/15/05 INDEX***
COMMERCIAL											
Water	acre	\$ 3,275	\$ 582	\$ 147	\$ 4,004	\$ 582	\$ 4,586	TBD	\$ 582	\$ 5,168	TBD
Sewer	gallon	18.52	2.98	.82	22.32	2.98	25.30	TBD	2.97	28.27	TBD
Public Facilities	acre	915	401	50	1,366	401	1,767	TBD	401	2,168	TBD
Traffic	peak hour trip	1,480	444	73	1,997	444	2,441	TBD	443	2,884	TBD
Police	acre	2,287	440	104	2,831	440	3,271	TBD	440	3,711	TBD
Fire	acre	3,376	(2,036)	51	1,391	-	1,391	TBD	-	1,391	TBD
Local Drainage	acre	6,600	1,131	294	8,025	1,131	9,156	TBD	1,130	10,286	TBD
<u>INDUSTRIAL</u>											
Water	acre	\$ 3,275	\$ 582	\$ 147	\$ 4,004	\$ 582	\$ 4,586	TBD	\$ 582	\$ 5,168	TBD
Sewer	gallon	18.52	2.98	.82	22.32	2.98	25.30	TBD	2.97	28.27	TBD
Public Facilities	acre	915	166	41	1,122	166	1,288	TBD	165	1,453	TBD
Traffic	peak hour trip	1,470	447	73	1,990	447	2,437	TBD	447	2,884	TBD
Police	acre	503	(100)	15	418	-	418	TBD	-	418	TBD
Fire	acre	503	279	30	812	279	1,091	TBD	279	1,370	TBD
Local Drainage	acre	6,600	1,131	294	8,025	1,131	9,156	TBD	1,130	10,286	TBD

- * THE FEES EFFECTIVE 1/15/03 WILL ALSO BE ADJUSTED AUTOMATICALLY ON THAT DATE BY THE 3.8% ENGINEERING COST INDEX AS PUBLISHED BY ENGINEER NEWS RECORD FOR 3 MONTH PERIOD ENDED MARCH 2002, AS CALCULATED ABOVE
- ** THE FEES EFFECTIVE 1/15/04 WILL ALSO BE ADJUSTED AUTOMATICALLY BY THE PERCENTAGE, TO BE DETERMINED, EQUAL TO THE ENGINEERING COST INDEX AS PUBLISHED BY THE ENGINEER NEWS RECORD FOR THE PERIOD MARCH 2002 TO MARCH 2003, WHICH WILL BE IN ADDITION TO THE ENGINEERING COST INDEX ADJUSTMENT TO BE IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVE 1/15/03, AS DESCRIBED IN FOOTNOTE * ABOVE
- *** THE FEES EFFECTIVE 1/15/05 WILL ALSO BE ADJUSTED AUTOMATICALLY BY A PERCENTAGE, TO BE DETERMINED, EQUAL TO THE ENGINEERING COST INDEX AS PUBLISHED BY THE ENGINEER NEWS RECORD FOR THE PERIOD MARCH 2003 TO MARCH 2004, WHICH WILL BE IN ADDITION TO THE ENGINEERING COST INDEX ADJUSTMENTS TO BE IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVE 1/15/03 AND 1/15/04, AS DESCRIBED IN FOOTNOTES * AND ** ABOVE

TBD: TO BE DETERMINED



CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT MEETING DATE: AUGUST 21, 2002

REQUEST TO SUPPORT A STUDY TO IDENTIFY THE CITY'S NATURAL RESOURCES AND TO RECOMMEND PRESERVATION METHODS

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S): 1. Provide direction to staff if Council is interested in a study to complement the Bikeways Master Plan; 2. Provide comments to the scope of the proposed study; and 3. Direct staff to explore grants or other funding sources.

Agenda Item # 22
Prepared By:
Recreation &
Community Services
Manager
Submitted By:

City Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: At the June 18, 01 meeting of the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) a presentation on preserving local natural resources by Mark Grzan and Commissioner Puder was received. The PRC referred this item to the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) for consideration of trails within the scope of the committee and to consider the need for funding a natural resources study; explore impact and revisions within the Measure P process which may address natural resource issues; for recommendation back to the PRC.

In July 01, the BAC agreed to change their scope and expand their name to Bicycle and Trails Advisory Committee (BTAC). The BTAC scope now includes trails and natural resources. The BTAC participated in a field trip led by Mark Grzan and Commissioner Puder and discussed a scope of study. In Sept. 01 the BTAC approved a scope of work for a "Trails and Natural Resources Study"—attached memo. This item was discussed at the Nov. 20, 01 meeting of the PRC. The PRC had some issues for the BTAC to consider. At the January 29, 02 PRC meeting they agreed with the BTAC's scope and recommended a study to Council to determine types of appropriate use of trails; design guidelines for trails; and to provide a mechanism by which developers can/should contribute to trails. The study does not include natural resources such as flora and fauna issues. In February 02, staff was faced with a 5% budget reduction and determined that this item would be brought before Council after the budget discussions were complete.

The recommendations are based on the BAC's Bikeways Master Plan. The following findings support the study: A. The City should focus its recreation resources on providing active recreational facilities, along with projects that preserve scenic resources and improve trail access within the community. B. A system of walking and bicycling trails is desired by the community, especially along the City's creeks and drainage channels. C. Recommendation to enhance partnerships with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to develop trails and linear parks along existing creeks and drainage channels. Recommended trails are included in the Draft Bikeways Master Plan. D. Goal is to include a comprehensive and coordinated system of bicycle paths, lanes and routes that serve as a safe and viable transportation and recreational network connecting neighborhoods, schools, parks and recreation facilities, work places, the library, civic center and other community facilities, and regional trails.

Based on these recommendations, potential funding sources, and compatibility of bicycles and trails; staff is requesting that Council consider the need for supporting a natural resources (creeks and trails) study and to explore revisions within the Measure P process which may address natural resource issues.

FISCAL IMPACT: Funding of \$20,000 for this study is not budgeted. Staff, if directed, could explore funding alternatives such as grants and report back to Council.

SCOPE OF WORK FOR A "TRAILS AND NATURAL RESOURCES STUDY"

BTAC recommended to the Parks and Recreation Commission that a "Trails and Natural Resources Study" be performed. This report recommends a scope of work for the "Trails and Natural Resources Study."

Scope of Work:

- ✓ Identify where trails can be established along creeks and streams within the sphere-of-influence of the City of Morgan Hill. Compile a database of existing City Studies (i.e. Bikeway Master Plan, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the General Plan and existing City Code). Also, compile a database of natural resources of the creeks within the City that were prepared by other Agencies (i.e. Draft Environmental Studies for the West Little Llagas Creek EIR/EIS by the Corps of Engineers and SCVWD).
- ✓ Prepare maps of path alignments near creeks that are identified in existing Plans/Master Plans. Prepare maps and cross-sections for potential new bike/pedestrian paths aligned near creeks.
- ✓ Evaluate coordination potential with other local and regional bike/pedestrian facilities. Identify how bike/pedestrian paths adjacent to creeks can be interconnected (Coyote Creek bike/pedestrian path extension south to Gilroy). Identify how the Community Park/Indoor Recreation Center/West Little Llagas Creek Bike/Pedestrian facility can complement each other.
- ✓ Develop a Review Checklist to ensure consistency with the Bikeways Master Plan. The Checklist should include on-site improvements, such as bike parking, and off-site improvements, such as roadway striping and intersection improvements.
- ✓ Develop an implementation plan and cost estimate for bike/pedestrian facilities.
- ✓ Identify available grants and funding.
- ✓ Summarize in a final document and present to BTAC, PRC and Council for approval and adoption.

Report from Cary Keaten, Deputy Director of Public Works, presented to PRC January 29, 02



CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT MEETING DATE: AUGUST 21, 2002

COMMUNITY CENTER AND PLAYHOUSE RENTAL FEES AND SCHEDULING PRIORITIES

Agenda Item # 23
Prepared By:
Manager, Recreation &
Community Services
Submitted By:
•

City Manager

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S): Adopt a resolution establishing Community Center and Playhouse Facility Rental Fees and Scheduling Priorities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At its July 31, 2002 meeting, City Council provided input to staff regarding various facility rental policies and fees. This information is being incorporated into various policies and procedures for the operation of these facilities. Council provided direction in four areas: 1. Community Access: to provide for renting the kitchen independently; long-term rental commitments for non-prime times only with prime time Friday evening after 5pm, all day Saturday and Sunday.; 2. Discounts: proceed with rates as presented except to provide a wider range between technical and non-technical rehearsals; 3. Private Concessionaires and caterers: continue to explore possibilities and maintain flexibility with a local vendor preference; 4. Scheduling Priority: proceed with proposed categories as presented.

Attached is a resolution to adopt recommended facility rental fees. These fees were developed with a philosophy that rental fees should recover a portion of the costs of operating the facilities. At the same time, it is staff's desire to establish fees which are not only based on cost recovery assumptions, but which also provide more affordable, reduced fees as an incentive for use of the Community and Cultural Center by local residents and groups. To do this, a graduated rate schedule has been developed where possible for each facility use. This schedule is attached to and incorporated in the Resolution as Exhibit A. Council and staff acknowledge the cost recovery goals are high and will provide a status report on a quarterly basis as directed at the Council meeting of July 31, 2002. Where ever possible, rental fees have been separated into the following four categories:

Category A: Official City use or City Sponsored Events are not charged.

Category B: Morgan Hill residents and organizations or businesses which are comprised of at least 60% Morgan Hill Residents receive a 20% discount from market rate.

Category C: Morgan Hill non-profit (501c3) organizations receive a special non-profit rate.

Category D: All others are charged a market rate.

It is staff's intention to begin accepting reservations for the 2003 year on September 3, 2002 and to market the facility at the Taste of Morgan Hill event in late September.

FISCAL IMPACT: Rental rates are based on revised budget projections reviewed by Council during the budget workshops and reflect cost recovery assumptions.

RESOLUTION NO. 5609

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL ESTABLISHING FACILITY USE RENTAL FEES FOR THE COMMUNITY AND CULTURAL CENTER AND COMMUNITY PLAYHOUSE

WHEREAS, the City of Morgan Hill provides numerous recreation services and leisure opportunities for its citizens through a wide variety of facilities; and,

WHEREAS, on May 15, 1991, the City Council of the City of Morgan Hill adopted Ordinance No. 1030, N.S., codified as Chapter 3.54 of the Morgan Hill Municipal Code, which establishes city policy as to the criteria for establishment of fees to be charged for recreation services, including rentals, and a methodology for adjustment thereof; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the operational costs of facilities necessitates charging fees to the public for rental of such facilities; and,

WHEREAS, City staff has provided information to the City Council regarding the costs of providing facility rental to the general public, and the analytical process used to arrive at calculation of such costs; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the methodology set forth by consultants and staff regarding calculation of the fees to be charged for facility rentals establishes a reasonable relationship between the costs inherent in providing such services and the fees to be charged, given the policy reasons which were also set forth by staff and consultant and which are incorporated herein, including but not limited to concerns of access to the facilities by a broad range of citizens; and.

WHEREAS, the City Council duly considered all written and verbal information presented to it on this matter at its meetings of July 31st and August 21st, 2002, which testimony and exhibits are hereby incorporated into the record of this matter.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Morgan Hill, based upon all documents, statements and facts known to the City, does hereby resolve:

SECTION 1. <u>Facility Rental Fee Schedule Adoption</u>. Based upon the record before it and the findings set forth above, the City Council hereby adopts the schedule of facility rental fees attached hereto and incorporated herein as <u>Exhibit A</u>. The City Council directs the City Manager to have the appropriate City departments apply and collect said fees.

SECTION 2. Separate Fee For Each Process; Additional Fees and Refunds. All fees set by

City of Morgan Hill Resolution No. 5609 Page -2-

this resolution are for each identified process or service. Additional fees shall be required for each additional process or service that is requested or required. Where fees are indicated on a per unit basis of measurement, the fee stated is for the identified unit or portion thereof within the indicated ranges of such units.

SECTION 3. <u>Collection of Fees.</u> The fees specified in <u>Exhibit A</u> shall be charged and collected beginning September 1, 2002, and thereafter.

SECTION 4. <u>Interpretation.</u> This Resolution may be interpreted by the City Manager. Should there be a conflict in regards to the applicability of the fees, or the charges imposed thereunder, the City Manager is authorized to determine which fee, or combination thereof, should be applied.

SECTION 5. <u>Severability.</u> If any portion of this Resolution is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction then it is the intent of the City Council that all other portions of the Resolution shall be severed and remain in full force and effect.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Morgan Hill at a Regular Meeting held on the 21st Day of August, 2002 by the following vote.

AYES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: NOES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: ABSTAIN: COUNCIL MEMBERS: COUNCIL MEMBERS:

CERTIFICATION

I, IRMA TORREZ, CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL, CALIFORNIA, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 5609, adopted by the City Council at the Regular Meeting on August 21, 2002.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL.

DATE:	
	IRMA TORREZ, City Clerk

Community and Cultural Center

Rental Fee Schedule

Room Use	Hourly Rate Prime Time Rentals (Friday after 5 pm & all day Saturday, Sunday, & available Holidays)	Hourly Rate Non-Prime Time Rentals
Hiram Morgan Hill Room (Multi- Purpose Room)	(4 Hour Minimum)	(No Minimum)
Group B Fee Rate	\$100	\$60
Group C Fee Rate	\$50	\$50
Group D Fee Rate	\$125	\$75
Deposit (no alcohol served)	\$350	\$150
Deposit (alcohol served)	\$500	\$250
El Toro Room (Octagonal Room)	(4 Hour Minimum)	(No Minimum)
Group B Fee Rate	\$80	\$40
Group C Fee Rate	\$30	\$30
Group D Fee Rate	\$100	\$50
Deposit (no alcohol served)	\$350	\$150
Deposit (alcohol served)	\$500	\$250
Amphitheater	(4 Hour Minimum)	(No Minimum)
Group B Fee Rate	\$160	\$120
Group C Fee Rate	\$30	\$30
Group D Fee Rate	\$200	\$150
Deposit (no alcohol served)	\$500	\$350
Deposit (alcohol served)	\$750	\$500

Poppy Jasper Room Madrone Room (Multi-purpose Meeting Rooms) Kitchen	(No Minimum)	(No Minimum)
Group B Fee Rate	\$40	\$35
Group C Fee Rate	\$30	\$30
Group D Fee Rate	\$50	\$30
Valley Oak Dance Room Henry Coe Fine Arts Room Sycamore Ceramics Room Children's Pavilion	(No Minimum)	(No Minimum)
Group B Fee Rate	\$40	\$35
Group C Fee Rate	\$30	\$30
Group D Fee Rate	\$50	\$30
Fees For Additional Services (all Groups)	(2 Hour Minimum)	(2 Hour Minimum)
Reservation Processing Fee (Required for all uses, non-refundable)	\$17	\$17
Rental Deposit per reservation	50% of Total Rental Fee	50% of Total Rental Fee
Special Janitorial Service	\$25	\$25
Set-up/Tear-down Staff	\$25	\$25
Event Attendant Staff	\$20	\$20
Any Required Private Security	Provided by User	Provided by User
Reservation Cancellation Fees:		
Less than 14 days prior to event	Total Rental Fee	Total Rental Fee
14 to 30 days prior to reservation	Full Rental deposit per room	Full Rental deposit per room
30 to 60 days prior to reservation	50% rental deposit per room	50% rental deposit per room
More than 60 days prior to reservation	\$0	\$0

COMMUNITY PLAYHOUSE

RENTAL FEE SCHEDULE

Performance is any event in the Playhouse to which the public is invited or when tickets are sold. Technical rehearsal is a rehearsal in which the set lights, soundboard etc. are used. Non-Technical rehearsal is a rehearsal in which there are no technical requirements.

Reservation Processing Fee: Rental Deposit:	\$17 per reservation for all uses (non-refundable) 50% of Total Rental Fee	
Productions:	\$225	**4 hour minimum
Technical Rehearsal:	\$125	Daily
Non-Technical Rehearsals:	\$20	**4 hour minimum
Meetings		
Meetings (Group B)	\$50 per hour	**4 hour minimum
Meetings (Group C)	\$30 per hour	**4 hour minimum
Meetings (Group D)	\$75 per hour	**4 hour minimum
Additional Services*		
Playhouse Supervisor	\$25 per hour	4 hour minimum
Janitorial Service	\$25 per hour	3 hour minimum
Lighting and Sound Technicians	\$25 per hour	2 hour minimum
Staff Attendant	\$20 per hour	2 hour minimum
Stage Hands	\$20 per hour	2 hour minimum
Box Office Staff	\$20 per hour	2 hour minimum
Cancellation Fees:	_	
Less than 14 days prior to reservation:	Total Rental Fee	
14 to 30 days prior to reservation:	Full Rental Deposit	

50% Rental Deposit

30 - 60 days prior to reservation:

More than 60 days prior to reservation: No fee

^{*} Services beyond an 8 hour day and some holidays will be charged at 1.5 times the hourly rate.

^{**} Minimum hours required for prime time use only except for additional services.